

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/879,719**

Applicant(s)  
**Curtis**

Examiner  
**Deborah Ware**

Art Unit  
**1651**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Deborah Ware

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Stephen Eland

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 9, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-27

Identification of prior art discussed:

Smith et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed claim changes of which the examiner agreed to consider upon receipt of the response to the last office action which was final. The Applicant's Representative further iterated that the Smith reference, cited of record, does not teach the claimed method(s) because Smith simply is a fill station and does not teach circulating nor does it teach feedback which are encompassed by the detecting and varying steps of the claimed method 1. The Smith reference as set forth by Applicant does not provide for circulating and further does not teach a disposable liner. The examiner does point out in the last office action that the liner is likened to a layer as disclosed by the reference, Smith, wherein the layer is a polystyrene material which can be disposable. However, Applicants' point out that there is no circulating step which they conclude does not read on a transferring step as disclosed by Smith et al. Examiner agreed to reconsider the claims on the merits with the changes discussed and proposed by the Representative upon receipt of Applicant's amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**DEBORAH K. WARE**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required